

CHAPTER ONE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<u>CHAPTER ONE - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	17
1.1 INTRODUCTION	17
1.1.1 Major Themes of General Plan	17
1.1.2 Organization of the Plan	19
1.1.3 Required General Plan Issues	19
1.1.4 Public Participation Process	19
1.1.5 Environmental Impact Report (EIR)	20
1.1.6 Annual Review	20
1.1.7 Amending the General Plan	25
1.1.8 Consistency	25
1.1.9 Implementing Ordinances, Plans, and Programs	26
1.2 BACKGROUND	27
1.2.1 Geographical Setting and Climate	27
1.2.2 History	28
1.2.3 Regional Setting	30
1.2.4 Population	31
1.2.5 Economy	32
1.3 NEEDS AND GOALS	37
1.3.1 Land Use Element Needs and Goals	37
1.3.2 Housing Element Needs and Goals	38
1.3.3 Transportation Element Needs and Goals	39
1.3.4 Environmental Quality Element Needs and Goals	39
1.3.5 Public Facilities and Services Element Needs and Goals	40 40
1.4 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS	41
1.4.1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures	41
1.4.2 Summary of Mitigated Environmental Impacts	47

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of the General Plan is to:

FORMALLY STATE the development and redevelopment policies of the City and

SET FORTH a framework of principles and standards, policies and programs that will

GUIDE future decisions affecting the development, maintenance and land use management of the City so as to

CREATE a desirable environment for living, working and playing and

ACCEPTABLY LOCATE those facilities which contribute to the social, economic and cultural goals of the community.

1.1 INTRODUCTION

In 1960, the City of Santa Clara first prepared and adopted a comprehensive General Plan to help guide the City's future. Since then, the City has increased significantly in size, activity and complexity. Appropriate amendments to the Plan have been adopted from time to time, reflecting important changes in City policy. Government Code Section 65302 lists seven elements cities must include in their general plans: land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise, and safety. The City of Santa Clara has consolidated the State mandatory elements to reduce or eliminate redundancies. The consolidated Elements are Land Use, Housing, Transportation, Environmental Quality and Public Facilities and Services. The current revision of the General Plan Text and related Land Use and Circulation Diagram is intended to be comprehensive in order to ensure internal consistency among the Elements.

The General Plan will guide the City's development and quality of life through the year 2005. The General Plan will also help prepare the City for issues that may arise within the next 15 years but extend beyond 2005.

1.1.1 Major Themes of the General Plan

Although the amount of remaining vacant land in the City is relatively insignificant compared with the amount of past development, this Plan anticipates continued development and redevelopment of underutilized properties other than those general planned and zoned for single family residential. The General Plan recognizes preservation and enhancement of recognized single family areas.

New development policies in the Land Use Element support the need to retain diversity in the heavy industrial area east of Lafayette Street and south of the Bayshore Freeway. Other than permitted retail uses, new development will be limited to low intensity industrial uses in this area. Other industrial areas within the City will be redesignated to Light Industrial or Office/Research and Development to better reflect existing and desired uses in these areas. To further retain and encourage the existing largely electronics and related

employment base between the Bayshore Freeway and the Southern Pacific Railroad within the Light Industrial area, building heights will generally be limited to an average of 2-stories with a building coverage of 50 percent. Within the Office/Research and Development areas north of the Bayshore Freeway, there will be a seventy foot height limit for buildings except when the City allows higher buildings on a future case by case basis in conjunction with a project's environmental review. This change is seen to encourage the concentration of employment in areas where access to transit such as the Light Rail is greatest.

Another major change in the Land Use Element is the designation of a number of sites for mixed use. The purpose is to encourage more residential construction over the next fifteen years in commercial areas as well as underutilized lands surrounding transit nodes and within the vicinity of residential support services such as schools, shopping areas, and parks.

The General Plan Housing Element recognizes the need for increased affordable housing within the community. The Plan also recognizes the need to preserve and expand the City's housing stock while attempting to maintain some balance between rental versus ownership opportunities, the variety of housing types and housing for a wide range of incomes and needs with an emphasis on affordable housing. The City's Redevelopment Agency will provide funding for affordable housing construction, senior housing, first time homebuyers and the homeless.

The Transportation Element discusses the importance of maintaining and expanding a safe, convenient and efficient transportation system that provides a variety of alternatives to the movement of people and goods. Improvements would occur to existing local thoroughfares as warranted by demand and cost effectiveness. Highway improvements would typically only be a priority when missing links or other significant impediments exist in the system. Emphasis is placed on alternatives to single occupant vehicle commuter trips such as increased use of carpools, buses and rail. Emphasis would also be provided to supporting a more coordinated transit system in the area and one that serves those most in need such as the handicapped, elderly, children and those who cannot drive.

The Environmental Quality Element discusses the need to preserve a quality environment in the City especially in the areas of water use, effective regulation of hazardous materials, air, regulation of noise sources and open space. Emphasis is placed on multiple uses of environmental resources such as parks for open space, wildlife and recreation use. Drought tolerant plantings and water efficient landscaping designs are encouraged. Endangered and threatened species are identified and their protection is proposed. Review of seismic and soil information ensures the consideration of potential natural and man-made hazards.

The Public Facilities and Services Element discusses the goals of on-going provision of efficient public facilities and services to serve the community. The City will continue to develop and encourage educational, cultural and recreational opportunities. The City also plans to provide library services that are accessible and adequately sized to serve community residents. Programs will be developed to create more effective recycling programs. Emphasis is placed on the efficient planning and prioritizing of facilities and services especially in the area of emergency response.

1.1.2 Organization of the Plan

The General Plan is made up of a text, diagrams, and other illustrations. The text is arranged in chapters.

Each chapter begins with Goals of the Element, description of existing conditions and/or a discussion of problems. Desired future conditions are stated in the form of Goals, Policies, and Programs which appear at the end of each chapter.

Goals are long-range in nature, while policies and programs are intermediate or short-range. Policies and programs guide day-to-day decision-making so that there is continuing progress toward the attainment of goals.

In summary, goals determine what should be done and where. Policies and programs establish who will carry out the goals, how, and when. Together they will determine the nature of the environment and the future character of Santa Clara.

The General Plan Technical Appendix is a separate document which contains supplementary information which is important reference material for some of the policies and programs, but is not essential to the day-to-day use in implementation of the Plan. The Technical Appendix is an adopted part of the General Plan.

The Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is part of the Technical Appendix. Also a number of background reports were prepared as part of the General Plan update. Included in the Technical Appendix are Economic and Fiscal Analysis of Santa Clara Report, Traffic Analysis Report and a Community Survey. The Technical Appendix is available, as a separate volume of the General Plan, at the Santa Clara City Public Library and at the Planning Division.

At the end of Chapter 7 is a glossary of terms. It is provided to assist the reader in understanding the Plan and to ensure that the terms used in the Plan are clearly defined to establish intent and to assist in interpretation. The glossary is not an adopted part of the General Plan. Where the definition of a term is to be adopted, it appears in the text of the Plan.

1.1.3 Relation of General Plan Chapters to State-Mandated Elements

State requirements for a city's General Plan are extensive and, in some cases, quite specific. This General Plan is a combination of Santa Clara's own circumstances and objectives with the requirements of State law. When there was conflict, State requirements prevailed but were tempered by local policies.

1.1.4 Public Participation Process

The process of updating the City's General Plan occupied more than three years of staff and community time, involving the gathering and analysis of past policy and large amounts of new data, as well as interacting with other public and private agencies. Several community meetings, preceded by a community survey, were conducted in order to learn the desired priorities of community members regarding the City's future. This direct participation by interested citizens, including members of other City Commissions and Boards, continued through the Public Hearings before the Planning Commission and City Council.

1.1.5 Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

This Plan has been processed in accordance with the applicable provisions of the California Government Code and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The General Plan Environmental Impact Report documents the likely environmental impacts resulting from implementation of this General Plan and necessary mitigation measures. The General Plan EIR has also been the subject of fully noticed Public Hearings as well as review by State and other local agencies. This EIR may be used as a starting point for the review of environmental impacts of specific project proposals in the future.

1.1.6 Annual Review

This General Plan is a statement of adopted policy and a guide for decisions to be made by the City Council, City Commissions, other governmental agencies and private developers and residents in Santa Clara. Pursuant to the adopting resolution, this Plan is reviewed annually to ensure that it accurately reflects current City Policy.

Once adopted, the General Plan does not remain static. State law permits up to four General Plan amendments per mandatory element per year (Government Code 65358[b]). Most amendments propose a change in the land use designation of a particular property. As time goes on, the City may determine that it is also necessary to revise portions of the text to reflect changing circumstances or philosophy.

LOCATION OF REQUIRED GENERAL PLAN ISSUES

(Chapter & Section)

	LOCAL RELEVANCE	DATA/ANALYSIS	POLICIES & PROGRAMS
LAND USE ELEMENT ISSUES			
Distribution of:			
Housing, business, and industry	YES	2.2, 2.4.3, 3.3.1	2.14, 3.24
Open space, including agricultural land	YES	2.4.5, 5.10	5.13
Mineral resources and provisions for their continued availability	NO	5.2.2	---
Recreation facilities and opportunities	YES	5.4.5, 6.5	5.13, 6.9
Location of:			
Educational facilities	YES	2.4.5, 6.2	6.9
Public buildings and grounds	YES	2.4.5, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5	6.9
Future solid and liquid wastes facilities	YES	2.4.5, 6.6.5, 6.6.6	5.13, 6.9
Identification of:			
Areas subject to flooding	YES	2.9, 5.6	5.13
Existing timberland preserve zone lands	NO	---	---

	LOCAL RELEVANCE	DATA/ANALYSIS	POLICIES & PROGRAMS
CIRCULATION ELEMENT ISSUES			
General location and extent of existing and proposed.			
Major thoroughfares	YES	4.3	4.14
Transportation routes	YES	4.3, 4.9, 4.11, 4.12	4.14
Terminals	YES	4.6, 4.7, 4.8, 4.10	4.14
Other local public utilities and facilities	YES	6.6	6.9

	LOCAL RELEVANCE	DATA/ANALYSIS	POLICIES & PROGRAMS
HOUSING ELEMENT ISSUES			
Assessment of immediate housing needs including:			
Number of existing households and housing units	YES	3.2.1	---
Level of payment compared to ability to pay: the number of very low and lower income households occupying units at a cost greater than 25% of their gross household income and comparison of the income distribution of low and moderate income households in the community to the range of costs of housing units for sale and for rent in the community	YES	3.2.2	3.18
Overcrowding: the number of households living in overcrowded conditions (1.01 or more persons per room)	YES	3.2.4	3.4
Housing stock conditions: the number of households living in housing units needing rehabilitation or replacement, identified separately for owner-occupied and renter-occupied units	YES	3.2.5	3.1
Special needs: assessment of the special needs of large families, farmworkers, the elderly, the handicapped, families with female head of households, the homeless, and other groups the community deems appropriate	YES	3.2.6	3.17, 3.20, 3.23, 3.29, 3.30, 3.31, 3.32

LOCATION OF REQUIRED GENERAL PLAN ISSUES

(Chapter & Section)

Projected new construction needs including:			
Analysis of population and employment trends and qualification of existing and projected housing needs for all income levels including the city's or county's share of regional housing needs and considering:	YES	3.2.1, 3.2.7, 3.2.9	3E, 3.9
Housing market demand	YES	3.2.10	3E
Employment opportunities	YES	3.2.7	3E
Availability of suitable sites and facilities	YES	3.4.1	3E
Commuting patterns	YES	4.2	3E, 4.14
Type and tenure of housing needs	YES	3.2.10	3E
Farmworker housing needs	YES	3.2.6	---
Analysis of existing and potential sites for housing of all types in the jurisdiction including:			
Survey of vacant residential zoned land and assessment of dwelling unit capacity and availability of infrastructure	YES	3.3.1, 3.4.1, 3.4.3	3.8
Survey of existing and potential redevelopment sites	YES	3.4.3	3E, 3.8
Survey of other sites suitable for residential development e.g., public surplus land, under-utilized residential commercial, and industrial areas, mixed use areas)	YES	3.4.3	3E, 3.8
Identify adequate sites to "meet the community's housing goals," including making "adequate sites provision for the existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community"	YES	3.4.3	3E, 3.8
Assessment of actual and potential governmental and non-governmental constraints on the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing for all income levels:			
Local land use controls and development standards (e.g. lot sizes, density, unit sizes, height limits, lot coverage, etc.)	YES	3.3.1	3E
Local building codes and their enforcement	YES	3.3.1	3E
On-site and off-site improvements of developers	YES	3.3.1	4.14, 5.13, 6.9
Local processing procedures, including zoning changes, use permits, building permits, environmental clearances, and any other types of permits, approvals, or clearance required prior to construction or rehabilitation of housing	YES	2.8, 3.3.1	3A, 3B, 3.11, 3.12
Local fees and other exactions required prior to construction or rehabilitation of housing	YES	3.3.1	3.5
Non-governmental constraints on the availability of housing, including availability of financing, price of land, and costs of construction	YES	3.3.2	3.14
Analysis of the opportunities for energy conservation in residential development including:			
The design and construction of individual units	YES	3.2.11	---
Subdivision design	YES	3.2.11	---
Assessment of the effect of energy conservation measures on the cost of housing in the long run	YES	3.2.11	---
Proximity of proposed residential development to employment centers, schools and other services and availability of transit services	YES	4.1, 6.2	4.14

LOCATION OF REQUIRED GENERAL PLAN ISSUES

(Chapter & Section)

	LOCAL RELEVANCE	DATA/ANALYSIS	POLICIES & PROGRAMS
CONSERVATION ELEMENT ISSUES			
Conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources including:			
Water and its hydraulic forces	YES	5.4, 6.6.1	5.13, 6.9
Forests	NO	5.3	---
Soils	YES	5.2	5.13, 6.9
Rivers and other waters	YES	2.2.4, 5.4, 5.6.2	5.13, 6.9
Harbors	NO	---	---
Fisheries	NO	---	---
Wildlife	YES	5.3	5.13
Minerals	NO	5.2.2	---
Other natural resources	NO	---	---

	LOCAL RELEVANCE	DATA/ANALYSIS	POLICIES & PROGRAMS
OPEN SPACE ELEMENT ISSUES			
Open space for the preservation of natural resources including, but not limited to:			
Areas required for the preservation of plant and animal life including habitat of fish and wildlife	YES	5.3, 5.5.2	5.13
Areas required for ecologic and other scientific study	NO	---	---
Rivers, streams, bays, and estuaries	YES	5.10	5.13
Coastal beaches, lakeshores, banks of rivers and streams, and watersheds	YES	5.6, 5.10	5.13
Open space used for the managed production of resources including, but not limited to:			
Forest lands, rangeland, agricultural lands and area of economic importance for the production of food and fiber	NO	---	---
Areas required for recharge of ground water basins	YES	5.4.2	5.13
Bay, estuaries, marshes, rivers and streams which are important for the management of commercial fisheries	NO	---	---
Areas containing major mineral deposits, including those in short supply	NO	5.2	---
Open space for outdoor recreation including, but not limited to:			
Areas for outstanding scenic, historic and cultural value	YES	6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5	5.13, 6.9
Areas particularly suited for park and recreation purposes, including access to lakeshores, beaches and rivers and streams	YES	6.5	5.13, 6.9
Areas which serve as links between major recreation and open-space reservations, including utility easements, banks and rivers and streams, trails and scenic highway corridors	YES	5.10	5.13

LOCATION OF REQUIRED GENERAL PLAN ISSUES

(Chapter & Section)

Open space for public health and safety including, but not limited to:			
Areas requiring special management or regulation because of hazardous or special conditions such as earthquake fault zones, unstable soils areas, flood plains, watersheds, areas presenting high fire risks, areas required for the protection of water quality and water reservoirs, and areas required for the protection and enhancement of air quality	YES	2.8, 5.2, 5.5, 5.6, 5.10, 6.5, 6.7.8,	5.13
Demands for trail-oriented recreational use	YES	4.11, 4.12, 5.10, 6.5	4.14, 5.13
The feasibility of integrating city and county trail routes with appropriate segments of the California Trails System	YES	4.12, 5.10, 6.5	4.14, 5.13, 6.9

	LOCAL RELEVANCE	DATA/ANALYSIS	POLICIES & PROGRAMS
NOISE ELEMENT ISSUES			
Identification and appraisal of major noise sources	YES	5.8.2	---
Existing and projected levels of noise and noise contours for major noise sources	YES	5.8.3	---
Determination of the extent of “noise problems in the community”	YES	5.8	---
Selection and imposition of methods of noise attenuation and the protection of residences from excess noise	YES	5.8.4	5.13

	LOCAL RELEVANCE	DATA/ANALYSIS	POLICIES & PROGRAMS
SAFETY ELEMENT ISSUES			
The effects of seismically induced surface rupture, ground shaking, ground failure, tsunami, seiche, dam failure	YES	5.2, 6.7.2, 6.7.5, 6.7.7	5.13, 6.9
The effects of slope instability leading to mudslides and landslides, subsidence, and other geologic hazards known to the legislative body	YES	5.2, 5.4.2	5.13, 6.9
Mapping of known seismic and other geologic hazards	YES	5.2	---
Flooding	YES	2.8, 5.2, 5.4, 5.6	5.13
Identification and appraisal of evacuation routes, peakload water supply requirements, and minimum road widths as they relate to identified fire and geologic hazards	YES	4.3, 6.7.5, 6.7.7	6.9
Hazardous wastes	YES	5.7, 6.6.5, 6.6.6, 6.6.7, 6.7.2	5.13, 6.9
Airport Safety Zone	YES	4.8, 5.8.2, 6.7.8	4.14, 5.13, 6.9

State law provides direction on how cities can maintain the plan as a contemporary policy guide: It requires each planning department to report annually to the City Council on "the status of the plan and progress in its implementation", Government Code 65400[b]. In addition, the City should comprehensively review the Plan every five years to determine whether or not it is still in step with community values and conditions.

1.1.7 Amending the General Plan

Amendments to the General Plan can be initiated by the City Council, Planning Commission, staff or property owners. More detailed information on processing and timing of amendments is available from the Planning Division.

Prior to filling a General Plan amendment, the prospective applicant or his or her agent should discuss the proposed amendment with the City's Planning Director or City Planner. This gives the applicant a first-hand opportunity to find out the details of the amendment process as well as any concerns the City may have about the proposed changes.

Should the applicant decide to proceed with an amendment, the next step is to request an amendment through a letter to the Planning Division in City Hall, 1500 Warburton Avenue, Santa Clara, CA. 95050 and pay the required processing fees.

Once an application is submitted and deemed complete, it will be placed on an agenda for public hearing before the Planning Commission according to the schedule established by the Planning Commission for General Plan amendments.

State law requires that any decision on a General Plan amendment must be supported by findings of fact. These findings are the rationale for making a decision either to approve or deny a project. At a minimum, the following standard findings should be made for each General Plan amendment:

- (a) The proposed amendment is deemed to be in the public interest.
- (b) The proposed General Plan amendment is consistent and compatible with the rest of the General Plan and any implementation programs that may be affected.
- (c) The potential impacts of the proposed amendment have been assessed and have been determined not to be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare.
- (d) The proposed amendment has been processed in accordance with the applicable provisions of the California Government Code and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

City-initiated amendments, as well as amendments requested by other public agencies, are subject to the same basic process and requirements described above to insure consistency and compatibility with the Plan. This includes appropriate environmental review, public notice, and public hearings leading to an official action by Council resolution.

1.1.8 Consistency

It is anticipated that Zoning Ordinance regulations, as well as the City's Housing Assistance Plan and Redevelopment Plans (University and Bayshore North), will be

brought into compliance with the Policies and Programs of the General Plan in as timely a manner as possible. It is also anticipated, besides evaluating the existing zoning on a subject property at the time of application for discretionary approval, that individual discretionary land use decisions made by the City following the adoption of this Plan will first strive for consistency and compliance with the Goals, Policies and Programs of this Plan.

1.1.9 Implementing Ordinances, Plans, and Programs

The Zoning Ordinance governs the use of land within the City. It determines the type of use, the density of living or working space, the general arrangement of buildings and required landscaping, and the necessary facilities, such as off-street parking, driveways, accessory structures and signs. The Zoning Map gives specific legal definition to the land uses provided for in the General Plan Land Use and Circulation Diagram.

The City's Subdivision Code, which is updated regularly to ensure compliance with State Subdivision laws, determines the standards for the division of land. Subdivision regulations set the requirements for street and utility improvements for a proposed development's drainage patterns, and the reservation of school and park sites.

In conjunction with the original General Plan in 1960, the first set of Precise Plans for the City were developed. Since that time, the plans have been maintained and updated by the City departments in charge of the respective functions. Present Plans include: 1) Streets and Highways; 2) Water; 3) Sanitary Sewers; 4) Storm Drainage; 5) Electrical; 6) Street Lighting; 7) Fire Protection; and 8) Parks and Recreation.

Precise Plans were allowed in general plans from 1937 until 1965. In 1965, Precise Plans were superseded in law by specific plans. However, some cities still use Precise Plans. Specific plans relate to areas of the city, whereas Santa Clara's precise plans relate to city functions.

Precise Plans are utilized by City staff and decision-makers to detail the design of functional sections within the General Plan. The Plans are used as the basis for estimating costs, proposing priorities, and scheduling in the Capital Improvement Program. The precise plans are not considered to be final or inflexible; rather, they represent a more specific view of how the General Plan may be used in controlling and holding the City's development to a high standard.

In accordance with the Streets and Highways Plan, Official Plan Lines are adopted by the City Council to establish building, sign and other structures' setbacks and rights-of-way on major streets identified for future acquisition and widening. A Plan Line is a precise line that establishes future rights-of-way along any portion of an existing or proposed street or highway.

The Capital Improvement Program determines the schedule for construction of public facilities. The Program establishes a priority list of needed improvements such as streets, sewers and parks. The Program estimates construction costs, identifies financing sources, and prioritizes projects over a five year period. The Program is updated yearly to account for changes in needs and revenues. The first year of the five year Capital Improvement Program is adopted annually as part of the City's budget.

The Capital Improvement Program thus provides a summary for City Council and public review of where municipal expenditures for facilities are proposed to be spent, both in terms of function and area.

The Planning Commission submits an annual report to the City Council regarding the Capital Improvement Program. The report reviews each project and its relative priority with regard to conformity with the General Plan.

The City operates in compliance with the requirements of State law, including the California Environmental Quality Act, which requires the City to review development proposals for their effects on the environment. The City's Project Clearance Committee (PCC) is the staff coordinating committee for review of Planning Commission applications. The PCC makes recommendations to the Planning Commission, Architectural Review Committee and the City Council based on an evaluation of potential environmental impacts of proposed developments. Environmental Impact Reports are prepared for major projects. These documents allow the City to determine the extent of identified potential impacts, as well as the adequacy of possible mitigation of those impacts or alternative project designs. The City's Environmental Review process is designed to ensure compliance with State laws and consistency with the Goals, Policies and Programs of this General Plan.

The City's Building and Housing Codes ensure that buildings and other structures in the City meet basic safety and health standards, consistent with the requirements of State health and safety codes. The City's Building and Housing Codes incorporates, in addition to other City specific regulations, the Uniform Building Code (UBC) and Uniform Housing Code (UHC). The Building Code establishes the construction, plumbing, and electrical specifications for construction in the City and is enforced through plan checking and on-site inspections by City Building Inspectors. The Housing Code regulations govern the condition of habitable structures with regard to health and safety standards, and which provide for the conservation and rehabilitation of housing in accordance with the City Building code. The City's Housing Inspectors can require repairs or authorize condemnation of dilapidated structures.

The Housing Code regulations govern the condition of habitable structures with regard to health and safety standards, and which provide for the conservation and rehabilitation of housing in accordance with the City Building code. The City's Housing Inspectors can require repairs or authorize condemnation of dilapidated structures.

The City's Code Enforcement Officer, assisted by the Planning Department's Law Enforcement Aides, enforce the Zoning Ordinance, conditions of discretionary approval, and applicable City Code sections such as the Noise Ordinance. This enforcement effort is intended to protect residential neighborhoods and business districts from inappropriate activities and nonconforming uses.

1.2 BACKGROUND

1.2.1 Geographical Setting and Climate

The City of Santa Clara, also known as the Mission City, is located in the Santa Clara

Valley within Santa Clara County, 50 miles south of San Francisco, and 382 miles north of Los Angeles. Santa Clara is bordered by the cities of San Jose on the north, east, and south, and Sunnyvale and Cupertino on the west. Santa Clara encompasses about 19.3 square miles or approximately 12,352 acres of land.

The Santa Clara Valley is located at the southern end of San Francisco Bay. It is bounded by the Santa Cruz Mountains on the west and the Diablo Mountain range on the east. The Valley between is characterized by flat, agriculturally rich and buildable expanses ideal for urbanization. Streams in the valley are abundant and, while providing adequate drainage, in the past have been a source of flooding. In the northern area, where Santa Clara is located, the problem has been amplified by the proximity of the Bay and the low elevation of the land. However, flood control improvements are being developed by the Santa Clara Valley Water District to contain the 100-year flood level. Also in the northern area, Santa Clara has had significant subsidence due to a drop in the underground water levels. This decline was the result of more water being removed from the underground sources than was being replaced. The Santa Clara Valley Water District has implemented since the late 1960's a program of recharging the ground water basin with imported as well as local water to reduce subsidence. The northern area is also characterized by underlying alluvial sediments and by Bay mud. Because these soils are less stable under certain seismic stresses, development in this area must utilize structural engineering standards which provide the necessary safety margins.

Elevations in the City range from four feet (4') above sea level near Lafayette and State Highway 237 to one hundred and fifty six feet (156') at Lawrence Expressway and Interstate 280. The latitude and longitude of City Hall in Santa Clara is 37 degrees, 21 minutes, 20 seconds North Latitude and 121 degrees, 57 minutes, 30 seconds West Longitude.

The climate of the area is excellent and described as Mediterranean. The temperatures are mild. Monthly averages range from 46 degrees to 71 degrees, with the maximum exceeding 90 degrees only sixteen days per year and temperature below freezing five times per year. Average daytime high for July is 81 degrees and average nighttime low for January is 41 degrees. Rain is concentrated in the winter months (November through March), leaving an average of 293 days a year with sunshine. This temperate climate allows a variety of outdoor cultural and economic activities as well as creating an ideal living environment. The main climatic problem is the frequent presence of a temperature inversion over the Valley that traps air pollution below.

1.2.2 History

Fertile soil, level land, abundant water, a temperate climate and a central location within the San Francisco Bay region have combined to form a pleasant and productive living environment in the City of Santa Clara throughout its long history.

There have been human inhabitants of the Bay Area for thousands of years. Archaeological records suggest that the Costanoans, aboriginal inhabitants also known as Ohlone Indians, moved into the Bay Area around AD 500 and replaced the original Hoka-speaking population.

The first written record of the area is from 1769 when the scouts of Juan Gasparde

Portola's Spanish expedition reported grassy plains spotted with oak trees and numerous Indian villages. On January 12, 1777, Padre de la Pena offered the first Mass of the Mission Santa Clara under a shelter of tree branches. The Mission prospered and was rebuilt in 1779, 1784, 1819, 1825 and finally in 1926 where it stands today, on the campus of Santa Clara University. The Spaniards found the valley floor ideal for vast herds of cattle and sheep which were raised primarily for hides and tallow. During the early nineteenth century, the agricultural emphasis shifted from cattle to grain production.

Following California's entry into the Union in 1850, Santa Clara began to lay the foundation for its transition from a rural town to a city. In 1851, the Jesuits founded Santa Clara University with a faculty of two and fifteen students. Soon after, in 1852, Santa Clara was incorporated as a charter city under the provisions of the State Constitution. The City officially platted a street system in 1866 to accommodate anticipated growth. This layout still exists in the Old Quad district.

Around 1870, Santa Clara began to take on regional and even national significance. The two developments most responsible for this were (1) the prosperity and academic achievements of the University and, (2) the transition to an orchard economy. By 1940, Santa Clara supported a population of 6,700 and was known as the prune capital of the world.

In 1894, the City initiated a municipal power utility and began generating power in 1896. The electric utility grew slowly with the City until the late 1940's when rapid growth required significant upgrading of the power distribution system. In 1980, the City started generating its own power and continues to seek new and cost-effective sources including cogeneration, geothermal, hydroelectric, wind and solar.

During World War II, industry began to locate in the City and develop for the first time an economy not subject to seasonal employment. It was the start of a tremendous immigration of population and industry to Santa Clara. To deal with the accompanying problems of urban growth, a planning commission was established in 1949 and two years later the City changed to the City Council/ City Manager form of government. To ensure high quality construction and sound engineering, zoning, subdivision and building regulations were enacted. The Engineering and Utilities Departments were expanded and full-time Planning and Building Departments were established.

The full effect of the massive urbanization generated by the growth of the Bay region and local employment opportunities was felt in the decade of the 1950's. Led by industry, all other sectors of the economy expanded rapidly, initiating a growth cycle that has yet to culminate. Between 1950 and 1960, the City's population increased by 403 percent, to 58,900. In 1960, a comprehensive General Plan was adopted to guide the City's continuing growth.

Available prime industrial land, a well managed city, and a supply of educated and highly skilled labor led to rapid industrial growth and development of more sophisticated electronics research and manufacturing establishments in the latter part of the 1960's. In 1970, new industrial construction reached \$24 million, the highest of any city in the State for that year. Recent years have exceeded that level, partially due to inflation.

In 1985, the City completed the purchase of the Great America Theme Park, in order to preserve this tourist-serving commercial attraction. Since that time, Theme Park attendance levels and revenues have reached all-time highs.

In 1986, the City Council also amended the Zoning Ordinance's minimum development standards for higher density residential zones. Historically, so as to protect single family areas such as the Old Quad from high density infill development on narrow or small lots.

Although many properties in the Old Quad area are zoned for higher density development, these ordinance changes showed the rate of change in this area of the City. This change was originally initiated by the Daily Plan much of which was adopted by the City in the 1960's. Dedication and improvement requirements of the City's Street Plan Lines continue to reflect this previous plan's higher density of development for the Old Quad, but can be reviewed and revised by the City Council at any time.

In 1986, the City completed the construction of the Santa Clara Convention Center, a 240,000 square foot facility which in 1990 hosted 67 conventions, trade shows and other public events attracting more than 319,000 visitors to the City. Next to the Convention Center, on City-owned lands, are the Santa Clara Golf and Tennis Club, the Westin Hotel and TECHMART, which is designed to feature the latest state-of-the-art electronic equipment manufactured by Silicon Valley companies.

The vitality of the rest of Santa Clara has matched that of its economy. As part of Santa Clara's strong recreation program, the Santa Clara Swim Club has won numerous team and individual honors in national and international competition, as have the Santa Clara Vanguard and Bugle Corp and the Santa Clara Aquamaids Swim Club. In 1987, the new home of the Triton Museum was completed across from City Hall in the Civic Center. The community also boasts several other museums, historical, arts, theater and dance groups, as well as many special events.

1.2.3 Regional Setting

The central location of the City of Santa Clara within the Santa Clara County and San Francisco Bay area has made the City a focal point for urbanization within the region. Santa Clara County, the metropolitan area which includes the City of Santa Clara, has one of the most vigorous economies in the State, and has the largest population of any county in northern California.

In 1990, the County population was approximately 1,463,530, a ten percent increase over the 1980 population of 1,295,071, and a 25 percent increase over the 1970 population, and equals five percent of the State's population of approximately 30,000,000. According to the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, Median household income in Santa Clara County in 1988 was \$47,647 a year for a family of four, second only to Marin County, which had the highest median income in California. In 1991, median county income for a family of four had risen to \$57,700. The County's total effective buying power is larger than that of twenty States in the Nation.

Santa Clara will continue to play an important role in, and benefit from, the ongoing development of the San Francisco Bay region. The City of San Jose recently became the largest city in the Bay Area and third largest in California after Los Angeles and San Diego,

surpassing San Francisco in number of residents. San Jose's degree of support for growth, both in number of jobs and in additional housing units, will continue to influence the nature of development in the greater San Jose metropolitan area through the 1990's.

The introduction of additional mass transit lines in the Santa Clara Valley, such as an extension of the Light Rail system westward to Sunnyvale and Mountain View as well as eastward to Milpitas and BART, and extension of CalTrain to southern Santa Clara County, will assist the overall region in reducing existing traffic congestion.

San Jose International Airport, while contributing significant levels of noise from airplane departures and arrivals, as well as additional traffic on surrounding streets and highways, also provides local economic advantages because it is a transportation gateway to the world. The Airport continues to examine ways to grow to better serve the region through long-range Master Planning and other programs while attempting to minimize adverse impacts on its neighbors. Even with this attempt, the Airport has a major adverse impact on housing in northern Santa Clara.

Because of the high mobility of the population and interdependence of the Bay Area economy, the future of the City cannot be separated from that of the County and the larger Bay region. Recognizing this, the City will continue to cooperate, on a voluntary basis, with other jurisdictions in resolving common problems as they are identified.

Many challenges that the City faces, such as air and water quality, flooding, management of solid and hazardous waste disposal, traffic congestion, and limited sites for housing development transcend local boundaries and cannot be solved by the City's actions alone.

As an example of regional cooperation, the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors, and a majority of cities representing a majority of population within the County prepared and adopted prior to December 1, 1991 a Congestion Management Plan (CMP). The CMP is a mechanism employing growth management techniques, including traffic level of service requirements, standards for public transit, trip reduction programs and capital improvement programming, for the purpose of controlling and/or reducing the cumulative regional traffic impacts of development. The CMP must be annually updated to maintain its relevance and effectiveness.

1.2.4 Population

Within the past forty years, the resident population of the City of Santa Clara has increased approximately 770 percent from a population of 11,702 in 1950 to a 1990 population of 92,191. According to the 1990 California State Department of Finance, Santa Clara ranks as the third largest city in Santa Clara County after San Jose (749,820 population) and Sunnyvale (117,331 population).

The majority of the City's population growth occurred within the decade from 1950 to 1960 when the population increased by nearly 50,000 persons, a growth of 400 percent, which accounts for almost three-fifths of the present population. Since 1960, growth of the resident population has tapered off: 46 percent between 1960 and 1970, less than four percent between 1970 and 1980, and five percent between 1980 and 1990.

Santa Clara's growth has not been an isolated or unique development. It has been part of

the overall growth of the San Francisco Bay area and San Jose metropolitan area in particular. Between 1950 and 1990, the population of Santa Clara County expanded from 300,000 to an estimated 1,463,600 persons. The City of Santa Clara's rapid growth has been paralleled by that of Sunnyvale and Mountain View, but does not approach the rate of growth of the City of San Jose.

The infilling process of growth in the area between San Francisco and San Jose has caused the development of most of the open land between these cities, including Santa Clara. The little land remaining undeveloped has increased significantly in price, and has contributed to a significant increase in housing prices throughout the region.

To maintain a balanced community and local economy, additional employment growth must be accompanied by the provision of additional housing opportunities, especially for those employees earning low to moderate incomes who are increasingly being priced out of the local housing market. Lower cost housing will become increasingly important as more of the City's employment base shifts to a service and tourist economy that offers a wider variety of jobs particularly in the entry level range.

Population projections by the Association of Bay Area Governments for Santa Clara for the year 2005 indicate that, with stable household size, a minimum of 3,865 new housing units will be needed to house the 9,200 additional local residents. The City projection of housing units by 2005 is five percent higher than the ABAG '90 projection. The resulting population is projected at 109,033. As detailed in the Housing Element, ethnic diversity in the community is expected to increase significantly, as will average age and income.

1.2.5 Economy

The economy of Santa Clara is built upon a manufacturing and commercial base. Diversification in the tourist oriented sector of the economy, as well as in the service area, has strengthened and stabilized this base.

The development of the silicon chip and electronic systems made possible by the integration of microprocessors spawned a multi-billion dollar industry in Santa Clara County between 1970 and 1990. The explosive growth of this industry during the 1970's and early 1980's has transformed the Santa Clara Valley, a fertile agricultural valley, into the world-renowned "Silicon Valley."

The City of Santa Clara is strategically located at the center of the employment growth which has occurred in this valley since the mid 1970's. Businesses in the City have participated fully in the most dynamic economic revolution of the second half of the 20th century.

Only with adequate fiscal resources will the City be able to provide essential municipal services to its residents and employees. To guide growth and development effectively, as part of the General Plan Update, the City prepared an economic and fiscal analysis of the community through 2005. That economic analysis is summarized here.

From the first half to the second half of the 1980's, Santa Clara experienced both a slowing of industrial and commercial construction and a shift away from industrial toward commercial development. Since 1980, the amount of occupied research and development

space in the City increased by 50 percent, but the amount of occupied light manufacturing and warehouse space declined slightly.

Although the growth of City population has been slower than that of the County, Santa Clara's taxable retail sales growth, a significant source of the City's revenues, has more than kept pace. This strength can be largely attributed to the sales growth of the automotive sector and electronics manufacturing through 1988, the last date for which figures were available for the economic analysis. The top three sales tax generators and 10 of the top 30 in the City in 1988 were either auto or RV dealers. Other top sales tax generators were Emporium-Capwell Department Store, National Advanced Systems Corporation, Xerox Corporation, Owens-Corning Fiberglass Corporation, Costco Wholesale, and Whirlpool Corporation.

During the latter part of the 1980's Santa Clara also enjoyed a rather high share (25 to 29 percent) of the hotel room revenues earned by the five communities central to the metropolitan area: San Jose, Sunnyvale, Mountain View, Milpitas and Santa Clara.

In 1965, jobs and resident workers in the City were in close balance; 27,581 workers and 25,200 jobs, a ratio of 1.09:1 (excluding agricultural contract and construction, which added at least another 1,500 jobs). By 1975, continued employment growth in the manufacturing sector had created an excess of local jobs over local workers. For instance, the top four manufacturing employers alone had more employees in 1971 than the entire manufacturing sector of the City in 1965.

This trend towards a jobs and housing imbalance, first identified in the City's 1980 General Plan, has continued despite the fact that the chip-driven high tech industries in the Valley suffered a period of adjustment from 1985 through 1987. In 1990, it is estimated that there are approximately 58,000 employed residents in the community and 119,270 jobs, a ratio of 2.06:1. In 1989 the eleven largest employers in Santa Clara were manufacturers. The top four of these manufacturers employed approximately 15 percent of the City's employees. In total, it is estimated that manufacturing concerns employed 52,400 persons in 1990 (the next largest type of employer was the services sector, which employed an estimated 26,600).

Figure 1-A:**STATISTICAL SUMMARY****POPULATION ESTIMATES**

	DOF <u>1990</u>	ABAG <u>2005</u>	CITY <u>2005</u>
TOTAL	92,191	102,600	109,033
HOUSEHOLD	89,240	99,200	105,633
GROUP HOUSING	2,951	3,400	3,400

HOUSING ESTIMATES

	DOF <u>1990</u>	ABAG <u>2005</u>	CITY <u>2005</u>
TOTAL UNITS	38,151	42,959	45,375
VACANCY RATE	3.38%	3.00%	3.00%
HOUSEHOLD UNITS	36,861	41,670	44,014
PERSON / HOUSEHOLDS	2.421	2.381	2.400

SQUARE FOOTAGE ESTIMATES

	ERA <u>1990</u>	ERA <u>2005</u>
RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT	9,940,000	12,008,000
LIGHT MANUFACTURING	5,029,000	4,637,000
WAREHOUSE	12,487,000	10,914,000
OFFICE	9,772,000	17,176,000
RETAIL	6,322,000	8,162,000

HOTEL ROOMS ESTIMATES

	ERA <u>1990</u>	ERA <u>2005</u>
HOTEL ROOMS	2,917	4,421

EMPLOYMENT ESTIMATES

	ABAG <u>1990</u>	ABAG <u>2005</u>
TOTAL EMPLOYMENT	119,270	144,200

ASSUMPTIONS: CITY Projection's of 3,400 group housing population, 3 percent vacancy rate, and 2.4 persons per household are in line with or a worse case than ABAG's Projection's 90.

SOURCE: Department of Finance (DOF), Demographic Research Unit, Report E-5; Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), Projection's 90; Economics Research Associates (ERA); City of Santa Clara Planning Division (CITY)

FIGURE 1-B:

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 50
LAND USE ACREAGE

MIXED USE

MIXED USE	362	2.9%
TRANSIT ORIENTED MIXED USE	109	0.9%
GATEWAY THOROUGHFARE	33	0.3%
	<u>504</u>	<u>4.1%</u>

RESIDENTIAL

SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED	3,488	28.0%
SINGLE FAMILY ATTACHED	193	1.4%
MODERATE DENSITY	855	6.9%
MEDIUM DENSITY	151	1.2%
HIGH DENSITY	1	0.0%
	<u>4,688</u>	<u>38.0%</u>

COMMERCIAL

CONVENIENCE	43	0.3%
THOROUGHFARE	116	0.9%
COMMUNITY & REGIONAL	61	0.5%
OFFICE	45	0.4%
TOURIST	414	3.4%
	<u>679</u>	<u>5.5%</u>

INDUSTRIAL

OFFICE / R & D	589	4.8%
INDUSTRIAL TRANSITION	18	0.1%
LIGHT	1,708	13.8%
HEAVY	583	4.7%
	<u>2,898</u>	<u>23.4%</u>

PUBLIC FACILITIES

INSTITUTIONAL	224	1.8%
EDUCATION	533	4.3%
PARKS & RECREATION	411	3.3%
OPEN SPACE	240	1.9%
***RIGHT-OF-WAYS	2,173	17.6%
	<u>3,581</u>	<u>29.0%</u>

TOTAL ACRES

12,350 100.0%

*Four and six tenths (4.6) acres of Mixed Use, Gateway Thoroughfare and Transit Oriented acreage are devoted to convenience commercial.

**Streets, Expressways, Highways and Railroads, etc

Source: City of Santa Clara Planning Division

FIGURE 1-C:**2000 ACTUAL LAND USE ACREAGE**

MIXED USE	MIXED USE	12	0.1 %
	TRANSIT ORIENTED MIXED USE	0	0.0 %
	GATEWAY THOROUGHFARE	12	0.1 %
		24	0.2 %
RESIDENTIAL	SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED	3,479	28.2 %
	SINGLE FAMILY ATTACHED	188	1.5 %
	MODERATE DENSITY	843	6.8 %
	MEDIUM DENSITY	110	0.9 %
	HIGH DENSITY	0	0.0 %
		4,620	37.4 %
COMMERCIAL	CONVENIENCE	30	0.2 %
	THOROUGHFARE	223	1.8 %
	COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL	148	1.2 %
	OFFICE	100	0.8 %
	TOURIST	259	2.2 %
		760	6.2 %
INDUSTRIAL	OFFICE / R & D	1,234	10.0 %
	INDUSTRIAL TRANSITION	18	0.1 %
	LIGHT	740	6.0 %
	HEAVY	678	5.5 %
		2,670	26.6 %
PUBLIC FACILITIES	INSTITUTIONAL	247	2.0 %
	EDUCATIONAL	543	4.4 %
	PARKS & RECREATIONAL	576	4.7 %
	OPEN SPACE	239	1.9 %
	***RIGHT-OF-WAYS	2,173	17.6 %
		3,778	30.6 %
VACANT	VACANT	498**	4.0%
		498	4.0 %
TOTAL ACRES		12,350	100.0 %

*Streets, Expressways, Highways and Railroads, etc

**Most of the vacant land has been approved for specific development

Source: City of Santa Clara Planning Division

Continued long-term job growth in the manufacturing sector is not expected. The services sector, however, is expected to grow nearly fifty percent by the year 2005. This will account for the majority of the job growth anticipated in the community in the period 1990-2005, when employment is expected to increase to approximately 144,200. Employment in the finance, insurance and real estate sectors is also expected to grow substantially.

The economic analysis, commissioned by the City as part of the General Plan revision, projects that 1.8 million square feet of retail space will likely be added in Santa Clara by 2005, with 65 percent of this space being targeted to serve a larger work force, as well as additional visitors to the City. Hotel rooms in the City are projected to increase from 2,900 to around 4,400, with most of the 1,900 new hotel rooms being added in the period 1995-2005.

The total office inventory in the City is expected to increase from 9.8 million square feet in 1990 to 17.2 million by 2005. The amount of research and development space is expected to experience a net gain of a little more than 2 million square feet, and light manufacturing and warehouse distribution space overall is expected to decrease.

The continued diversification of Santa Clara's economy is expected to help minimize unexpected economic downturns in the future.

1.3 NEEDS AND GOALS

1.3.1 Land Use Element Needs and Goals

Improvement in the social, economic and physical quality of the City is the overriding concern of the Land Use Element of the General Plan. Significant in the City of Santa Clara, as well as in the County of Santa Clara, is the need for affordable housing for those earning low to moderate incomes. This State-identified need is discussed in detail in the Housing Element.

Continued economic diversity is also needed, wherever the provision of new commercial development will not adversely impact the quality of the City's residential neighborhoods or designated historic areas.

Anticipated changes in the community are guided by the Land Use Element, accompanied by a map indicating the planned location, amount and intensity of residential, commercial, industrial, mixed use, public and open space lands. Design Guidelines assist in accomplishing a high quality standard of development in the City.

The City is committed to cooperating with other jurisdictions in seeking solutions to regional problems while maintaining control over local land use.

The Goals of the Land Use Element are to:

Promote the best use of land through protection of desirable existing uses, orderly development and consideration of the City's future needs while recognizing property owner rights. Emphasize the improvement of the social, economic and physical quality of Santa Clara. Continue to encourage the development of a sound and diverse economic base to support necessary public services. Encourage a stable employment demand corresponding to the City's labor characteristics. Work towards a sustainable combination of population and production. Cooperate with surrounding jurisdictions in seeking solutions to regional problems.

1.3.2 Housing Element Needs and Goals

Santa Clara has a variety of housing, in various sizes, price-ranges and locations. Beginning with the many different styles of Victorian-era working class and estate homes in the Old Quad constructed circa 1870, the City has historically accommodated a wide variety of peoples, with varying ethnic and religious backgrounds and different income levels.

Over time, the ratio of rental occupancy to the total number of housing units in the City has increased to the point where it is now estimated to exceed fifty per cent. At the same time, the ethnic composition has evolved, paralleling the changes experienced state-wide in California. Minority community issues and concerns are becoming an increasingly important consideration in assessing the needs and goals of Santa Clara through the year 2005.

Continued increases in area employment and a shortage of vacant, developable land will contribute to rising housing costs. These changes may also result in increasing densities of persons per residential unit.

Santa Clara's housing policies and programs address the identified needs for the community, including residents and those who work in the City. The most significant need in the community is affordable housing for those earning low to moderate incomes. Due to the shortage of available housing sites, new housing development will have to be considered at higher densities and designed in innovative ways to increase the quantity and affordability of local housing.

The estimated total number of housing units in 1995 is 42,292. The potential number of housing units which could be created in the City, by the year 2005, is 45,375, occupied by an estimated City population of approximately 109,033 persons. The Association of Bay Area Governments, however, has projected that the number of households in Santa Clara will actually only increase by 7,631, from the 1989 figure of 34,039 to 41,670 households in the year 2005. ABAG estimates that the population in 2005 would then be approximately 102,600. The City will be examining ways to increase new housing beyond the ABAG projections.

All projections of housing, population growth and employment are heavily dependent on economic trends. Substantial changes in current economic conditions can alter these

projections dramatically.

The Goals of the Housing Element are to:

Encourage the provision of appropriate/well-built housing within the community for persons of all economic levels, regardless of race, color, age, religion, gender, sexual orientation, marital status, national origin, ancestry, familial status, source of income, or mental or physical disability. Encourage the provision of an adequate variety of individual choices of housing tenure, type, and location, including higher density where possible, especially for low and moderate income and special needs households. Maintain and enhance the character, quality and livability of residential areas. Encourage sound growth in the City by designating suitable vacant or underutilized sites for new residential development. Preserve established single family neighborhoods.

1.3.3 Transportation Needs and Goals

Projections of future traffic volumes indicate that the travel demands of the region, which especially impact Santa Clara due to the City's central location in the region, cannot be satisfied by current patterns of circulation and projected road capacity.

The increasingly common separation of new housing opportunities from newly created jobs further impacts an already congested system of highways, expressways, and local streets.

The number one transportation need in the community is to encourage a change in commuter behavior to reduce the percentage of single occupancy vehicles using the road network during commute hours. This reduction will have positive environmental impacts, including a reduction in emissions which contribute to air pollution.

The Goal of the Transportation Element is to:

Strive to provide a safe and convenient integrated transportation system which moves people and goods from place to place efficiently and in a cost effective manner.

1.3.4 Environmental Quality Element Needs and Goals

Continuing changes in the Santa Clara Valley provide a challenge to the area to effectively protect environmental resources now and in the future. Of special concern are:

- preserving water capacity and quality;
- regulating hazardous materials use, storage or disposal;
- maintaining and improving air quality;
- minimizing noise impacts on developed areas; and,
- promoting open space preservation.

The Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures at the end of this Chapter represents a compilation of estimated impacts of anticipated development, and their inter-relationship with each of the General Plan Elements.

The Goals of the Environmental Quality Element are to:

Conserve and improve the environmental quality of the City. Continue an emphasis on improving the physical environment of Santa Clara.

1.3.5 Public Facilities and Services Element Needs and Goals

If the projections of the Association of Bay Area Governments are correct with regards to Santa Clara's anticipated growth between 1990-2005, the City and other agencies can expect a proportionate increase in demands on public facilities and services. Growth above or below these projected levels will also directly affect public facilities and services. Maintaining the existing level of quality service for City Departments such as Parks and Recreation, Police and Fire, as well as possibly expanding facilities and services, will be dependent on the types and amounts of available funding sources.

Community needs include:

- safety and emergency preparedness;
- energy conservation;
- continued solid waste disposal capacity, including effective recycling;
- coordinated capital improvements and budgeting; and,
- educational, recreational and cultural opportunities.

The Goal of the Public Facilities and Services Element is to:

Provide and encourage, within economic capabilities, needed facilities and services that contribute to the City's safety, convenience, amenity, educational and cultural enrichment.

1.4 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Identification of the broad environmental impacts of the General Plan Goals and Policies is incorporated into the Environmental Impact Report prepared in conjunction with the General Plan.

To summarize the environmental effects, a Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures from the Environmental Impact Report is attached for information purposes. To understand the full impacts from this General Plan, readers are advised to read the General Plan Environmental Impact Report.

1.4.1 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

These Items were based on the Environmental Impact Report certified as part of the adoption of General Plan Amendment #32, the Comprehensive of the General Plan (July 28, 1992).

A. LAND USE CONSISTENCY / COMPATIBILITY

IMPACT A1:

Implementation of the General Plan would allow increased urban development in the City and would change the distribution and pattern of land uses.

MITIGATION:

Land Use Policies 16, 17.
Land Use Program xiv.

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

IMPACT A2.

Development consistent with the General Plan would result in the potential for impacts resulting from incompatible land uses.

MITIGATION:

Land Use Policies 2-6, 11,12.
Land Use Programs (iii), (ix).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

IMPACT A3.

Development under the General Plan could result in inadequate public services in some areas of the City.

MITIGATION:

Public Facilities & Services
Policy 8.
Public Facilities & Services
Programs (xv), (xix).
Environmental Quality
Program (xx).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

B. POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND HOUSING

IMPACT B1.

Development consistent with the General Plan would increase the overall demand for housing and the demand for affordable housing by the year 2005 relative to jobs, thereby increasing the jobs-housing imbalance.

MITIGATION:

Housing Programs (i)-(xv),
(xvii)-(xxi), (xxiv)-(xxx),
(xxxiv)-(xxxvi).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

C. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

IMPACT C1.

Year 2005 traffic generated by development consistent with the General Plan would degrade traffic operations on several roadway segments below the City's traffic operations target of Level of Service D.

MITIGATION:

Transportation Policy 1.
Transportation Programs (iii),
(vi), (viii)-(ix), (xi), (xii),
(xiv), (xvi)-(xxii), (xxiv)-
(xxvi).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Significant,
Unavoidable.

D. AIR QUALITY

IMPACT D1.

Construction allowed under the General Plan would temporarily increase local PM (10) concentrations.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality
Program (xxvi).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

IMPACT D2.

Potential development under the General Plan would increase emissions of criteria air pollutants.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality Policy
19.
Environmental Quality
Program (xxiii).
Transportation Program (xv).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Significant,
Unavoidable.

CHAPTER ONE – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

IMPACT D3.

Projected development under the General Plan would exceed the ABAG population projection for 2005.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality Policy 19.
Environmental Quality Program (xxiii).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Significant,
Unavoidable.

Transportation Program (xv).

E. NOISE

IMPACT E1.

Construction allowed under the General Plan would generate intermittent high noise levels.

MITIGATION:

None Required.

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

IMPACT E2.

Development under the General Plan would result in exposure of increased numbers of people to unacceptable ambient noise levels.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality Policies 22, 25, 27.
Environmental Quality Programs (xxix)-(xxxiii),
(xxxvi)-(xxxix).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Potentially
Significant.

IMPACT E3.

Development under the General Plan would result in a slight increase in traffic noise.

MITIGATION:

None Required.

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

F. PUBLIC SERVICES

IMPACT F1.

Development under the General Plan would increase the demand for City police services.

MITIGATION:

Public Facilities & Services Programs (xvii), (xix)-(xxii).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

IMPACT F2.

Development under the General Plan would increase the demand for City fire services.

MITIGATION:

Public Facilities & Services Programs (xvi)-(xviii),
(xxiii).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

IMPACT F3.

Development under the General Plan could increase the number of students served by local school districts beyond existing capacity.

MITIGATION:

Public Facilities & Services Programs (vi)-(vii).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Potentially
Significant,
Unavoidable.

IMPACT F4.

Development under the General Plan could result in an increased number of patrons using the Central Library.

MITIGATION:

Public Facilities & Services Programs (ii)-(iii).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

IMPACT F5.

Development under the General Plan would result in residential development in the North sub-area, where library expansion is planned.

MITIGATION:

Public Facilities & Services Program (ii).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

IMPACT F6.

Development under the General Plan would increase the demand for solid waste services.

MITIGATION:

Public Facilities & Services Policy 7.
Public Facilities & Services Programs (xi)-(xiii).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

IMPACT F7.

Development under the General Plan would increase the amount of hazardous waste generated.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality Programs (iv)-(vi).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:

Less than Significant.

IMPACT F8.

Development under the General Plan would increase demand for wastewater treatment.

MITIGATION:

Public Facilities & Services Program (xiv).

**RESIDUAL
IMPACT:**

Less than Significant.

**G. OPEN SPACE, RECREATION AND
SCENIC RESOURCES**

IMPACT G1.

Development under the General Plan would convert existing open lands to urban uses, altering the open area of parts of the City and removing the scenic and recreational resource that open lands provide.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality Policies 28-34.

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:

Less than Significant.

IMPACT G2.

Development under the General Plan would result in increased demand for park land and recreational facilities due to increased population.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality Programs (xl)-(xlv).
Public Facilities & Services Policies 1-3.
Public Facilities & Services Programs (vi)-(v).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:

Less than Significant.

IMPACT G3.

Development consistent with the General Plan could degrade or destroy existing scenic resources within the City.

MITIGATION:

Land Use Policy 21.
Land Use Programs (xix)-(xxi).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:

Less than Significant.

**H. CULTURAL, ARCHAEOLOGICAL, AND
HISTORIC RESOURCES**

IMPACT H1.

Any proposed surface or subsurface ground disturbance in the vicinity of natural watercourses that would occur as a result of changes to the General Plan land use designations and intensities could disturb important archaeological deposits and destroy unique features, artifacts and ecofacts.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality Program (xlvii).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:

Less than Significant.

IMPACT H2.

Any proposed surface or subsurface ground disturbance that would occur as a result of changes to the General Plan land use designations and intensities could disturb important (pre-1940) archaeological deposits and destroy unique features, artifacts and ecofacts.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality Program (xlviii).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:

Less than Significant.

IMPACT H3.

Implementation of the General Plan would encourage increases in the intensity of development and allow for potential alterations to the historic character of land uses or structures.

MITIGATION:

Land Use Program (xviii).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:

Less than Significant.

CHAPTER ONE – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

IMPACT H4.

Development that would occur as a result of changes to the General Plan land use designations and intensities and that would encounter archaeological sites during construction, would likely result in an increase in unlawful collecting and vandalism.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality
Programs (xlvii)-(xlviii).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

IMPACT H5.

Project impacts to archaeological sites represent a potential contribution to an increasing number of sites lost to development in Santa Clara.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality
Programs (xlvii)-(xlviii).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

I. VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE

IMPACT I1.

Development under the General Plan could damage or remove potential habitat for special status species on vacant parcels in the City.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality
Programs (xi)-(xiv).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

IMPACT I2.

Development under the General Plan could damage or remove heritage trees.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality
Program (viii).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

IMPACT I3.

Development under the General Plan could contribute incrementally to the removal of burrowing owl habitat and the associated decline in the population of the species throughout Santa Clara County.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality
Program (xi).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

IMPACT I4.

Development under the General Plan would contribute incrementally to the loss of riparian vegetation and special status species habitat.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality
Program (xi).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

J. WATER SUPPLY AND WATER QUALITY

IMPACT J1.

Development of the northern Santa Clara area under the General Plan would increase the demand for water.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality
Policies 9-11.
Environmental Quality
Programs (xv)-(xvi).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

IMPACT J2.

Development of the northern Santa Clara area under the General Plan would require expansion of the existing water distribution system.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality
Programs (xviii)-(xx).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

IMPACT J3.

Siltation during construction of projects allowed under the General Plan would result in water quality degradation.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality
Policies 16-18.

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

IMPACT J4.

Surface runoff from projects allowed under the General Plan would result in water quality degradation.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality
Policies 16-18.
Environmental Quality
Program (xxi).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

IMPACT J5.

Leakage and/or spills of hazardous materials from development allowed under the General Plan would result in degradation of surface water and shallow groundwater.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality Policies 4, 5 and 18.
Environmental Quality Program (xxi).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

IMPACT J6.

Increased development due to development under the General Plan would increase the potential for contamination of the deep groundwater aquifer.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality Program (xxii).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

K. GEOLOGY, SOILS AND SEISMICITY

IMPACT K1.

Development under the General Plan would expose additional population and new structures to seismic

hazards.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality Policy 3.

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than

Public Facilities & Services Program (xxviii).

Significant.

IMPACT K2.

Structures and roadways developed consistent with the General Plan could be damaged by settling due to earthquake-caused liquefaction.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality Programs (ii)-(iii).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

IMPACT K3.

Structures and roadways developed consistent with the General Plan would be subject to soils with high shrink-swell properties.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality Program (ii).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

L. FLOODING HAZARDS

IMPACT L1.

Although no vacant parcels identified in the General Plan are within flood hazard zones, infill and redevelopment consistent with the Plan would subject persons and property to potential flooding.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality Policies 13-14.

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Potentially
Significant,
Unavoidable.

IMPACT L2.

Development under the General Plan would increase surface runoff.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality Policy 17.

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

IMPACT L3.

Development under the General Plan would require construction or improvement of drainage facilities.

MITIGATION:

Public Facilities & Services Program (xv).

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

M. ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

IMPACT M1.

Construction consistent with the General Plan would result in a marginal increase in energy consumption.

MITIGATION:

None Required.

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

IMPACT M2.

Development consistent with the General Plan would result in a marginal increase in operational energy consumption.

MITIGATION:

Public Facilities & Services Policy 6.

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than

CHAPTER ONE – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Public Facilities & Services
Programs (ix)-(x).

Significant.

IMPACT M3.

Development consistent with the General Plan would add incrementally to cumulative energy demand.

MITIGATION:

None Required.

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:

Less than
Significant.

N. AIR SAFETY

IMPACT N1.

A potential increase in the safety zones at San Jose International Airport, or development in these zones under the General Plan, could result in incompatible uses within these zones and could conflict with the airport safety policy in the General Plan.

MITIGATION:

Public Facilities & Services
Policy 13.

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:

Less than
Significant.

SOURCE: City of Santa Clara; Environmental Science Associates, Inc.

1.4.2 SUMMARY OF MITIGATED ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

These items are based on the Mitigated Negative Declaration as part of the approval of General Plan Amendment #50 for the Update of Land Use and Housing Elements (July 23, 2002).

A. CULTURAL RESOURCES**IMPACT A1:**

Implementation of the General Plan may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality Program (xlviii)

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

B. GEOLOGY AND SOILS**IMPACT B1.**

Implementation of the General Plan may expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality Policy
3. Public Facilities &
Services Program (xxviii)

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant

IMPACT B2.

Implementation of the General Plan may expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality Policy
3. Public Facilities &
Services Program (xxviii)

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

IMPACT B3.

Implementation of the General Plan may expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic-related failure, including liquefaction.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality
Programs (ii)-(iii)

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
significant

IMPACT B4.

Implementation of the General Plan may expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects if they are located on expansive soil, creating substantial risks to life or property.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality
Program (ii)

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
significant

C. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**IMPACT C1.**

Implementation of the General Plan may expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects if a project is located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65062.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality Policy
4

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
significant

D. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**IMPACT D1.**

Implementation of the General Plan may expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects if a project violates any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality
Policies 10 and 17 and
Program (xvii)

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

CHAPTER ONE – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

E. NOISE

IMPACT E1.

Implementation of the General Plan may expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects if a project would result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality
Policies 22, 24, and 26 and
Program (xxviii)

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant.

IMPACT E2.

Implementation of the General Plan may expose people to potential substantial adverse effects if a project is located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, and the project would expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

MITIGATION:

Environmental Quality
Policies 23 and 25 and
Programs (xxxii), (xxxxv),
(xxxvi) and (xxxvii)

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant

F. UTILITIES AND SERVICE

IMPACT F1.

Implementation of the General Plan may expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects if a project is not served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.

MITIGATION:

Public Facilities & Services
Policy 7 and Programs (xi),
(xii) and (xiii)

RESIDUAL

IMPACT:
Less than
Significant

* * * * *